

REMARKS

Claims 1-19 are pending in the application and the same are rejected. By this amendment, claims 1, 8, and 13 are amended. Accordingly, claims 1-19 remain in the application and are presented for review and further consideration by the Examiner.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-3, 5-10, 12-15 and 17-19 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Arndt et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,724,510 in view of Yoneda et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,564,337. (Examiner's Action, page 2, ¶ 3).

Applicants respectfully disagree.

Yoneda discloses a communication control method wherein an attempt is made to establish communication between two devices. If a failure to establish the communication occurs, a new network address for the second device is sought, using the MAC address of the second device. The condition that initiates finding the new network address of the second device is a failure in communicating with the second device. Yoneda does not disclose the condition being a mismatch between a returned MAC address and a recorded MAC address. Yoneda does not even disclose matching a returned MAC address with a recorded MAC address. Nor does Yoneda disclose initiating any activity responsive to a mismatch between such MAC addresses. Therefore, Yoneda does not disclose, responsive to a mismatch between a returned unique enduring identification and a recorded unique enduring identification, finding a current network address for an object device and replacing the recorded network address with the current network address.

In contrast, Applicant's independent claims 1, 8, and 13 include wording that finding a current network address for the object device and replacing the recorded network address with the current network address is responsive to a mismatch between the returned unique enduring identification and the recorded unique enduring identification. Neither Yoneda nor Arndt disclose a mismatch between a returned unique enduring identification and a recorded unique

enduring identification being the condition upon which finding a current network address for an object device and replacing the recorded network address with the current network address is initiated.

Additionally, Arndt discloses a method of detecting duplicate IP addresses on a network. Devices are queried for their IP address and MAC address. These addresses are compared to IP addresses and MAC addresses in a database to determine whether there are duplicate IP addresses on the network segment (Arndt, col.3, lines 4-45 and col. 10, lines 46-49). Although Arndt does not include the details of how duplicate IP addresses are found from the comparison, it is apparent that should a returned IP address match one in the database where the corresponding MAC addresses do not match, a duplicate is identified. It is also apparent from the purpose of the comparison, to identify duplicate IP addresses, that Arndt does not disclose comparing the MAC address received from querying the recorded IP address for an object with the recorded MAC address for the object. Such a comparison would not be useful in identifying duplicate IP addresses. Neither does Arndt expressly disclose or suggest performing such a comparison. Therefore, Arndt does not disclose comparing a returned unique enduring identification received from querying a recorded network address for an object device with a recorded unique enduring identification for the object device.

In contrast, Applicant's independent claims 1, 8, and 13, as amended, include wording that the returned unique enduring identification received from querying the recorded network address for the object device is compared with the recorded unique enduring identification for the object device. Neither Arndt nor Yoneda disclose the two unique enduring identification being compared being a returned unique enduring identification received from querying a recorded network address for an object device and a recorded unique enduring identification for the object device.

The Examiner has rejected claims 4, 11 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Arndt in view of Yoneda and in further view of Nelson et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,835,720. (Examiner's Action, page 5, ¶ 1).

Applicants respectfully disagree.

In view of Applicants' arguments and amendments with respect to independent claims 1, 8, and 13 being allowable, Applicants respectfully submit that the remaining dependent claims are also allowable because they contain all of the limitations of their respective independent claims and further add structural and functional limitations.

The foregoing amendments and arguments are believed to be a complete response to the most recent Examiner's Action.

No new matter has been added.

It is respectfully submitted that there is no claim, teaching, motivation, or suggestion in any of the cited art, alone or in combination, to produce what Applicants claim.

It is further submitted that the application, as amended, defines patentable subject matter and that the claims are in a condition for allowance. Such allowance at an early date is respectfully requested.

Should any issues remain which would preclude the prompt disposition of this case, it is requested that the Examiner contact the undersigned practitioner by telephone.

Respectfully submitted,
Susan M. Janz,
Donald J. Gathman, and
Burton H. Poppenga

By 
Mark G. Pannell
Reg. No. 40,761

Date 07/29/2004
(719) 260-7900